

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: FW: Status of Portland Harbor lamprey/sturgeon debate
Date: 06/14/2006 09:20 AM

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: OMEALY Mikell
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 4:37 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L; ANDERSON Jim M; PEDERSEN Dick
Subject: RE: Status of Portland Harbor lamprey/sturgeon debate

Thanks very much for this addition, Jennifer.

Dick and Jim -- here's a good clarification from Jennifer about our concerns with the radio telemetry studies, just FYI.

-----Original Message-----

From: PETERSON Jenn L
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 3:16 PM
To: OMEALY Mikell
Subject: RE: Status of Portland Harbor lamprey/sturgeon debate

Just for the record, I basically agree with the studies that the LWG has proposed. We need to work through the details of the studies through the FSP development, and as they say "the devil is in the details". When we dive into the details we will know more how close we are to being in agreement.

As discussed in our June 7th technical meeting on the proposed lamprey / sturgeon studies there are real issues with how any exposure information gained from radio telemetry would be used in the risk assessment. For lamprey, any exposure information could help refine our knowledge of contribution from the site to lamprey tissue residues. However, the analysis of lamprey body burden for this analysis will be continually confounded by a lack of understanding of the body burden they receive from the ocean.

For sturgeon, ODFW has stated that we will be lucky to collect even one adult sturgeon. Therefore, radio tagging is unlikely to give us any meaningful information that we can confidently use to refine our estimates of exposure duration within the site. However, the LWG did agree to collect sturgeon at a time (winter) when there is a higher likelihood in collecting larger sturgeon (sub adult and adult). If they did collect some adult sturgeon they did agree to consider taking a tissue plug. Interpreting the what a tissue plug concentration means in assessing risk to the fish can be problematic. However, this information used as a monitoring tool, or used in a comparison of reference conditions. We did voice our concerns at finding an appropriate reference area, but if we narrowed down the list of COPCs (by first comparing to conservative TRVs), that might make finding a reference location easier. I should note the tribes are apposed using comparison to reference as a means of interpreting the data, but we did mention that this methodology is prevalent throughout EPA's eco risk guidance (it just has to be done appropriately).

Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: OMEALY Mikell
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2006 10:22 AM

To: ANDERSON Jim M; PEDERSEN Dick
Cc: PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: Status of Portland Harbor lamprey/sturgeon debate

Dick and Jim,

In preparation for tomorrow's Portland Harbor Senior Managers meeting, here is a brief update on where we are with the lamprey/sturgeon issue. As you know, the natural resource trustees have been internally debating the value of various lamprey/sturgeon studies for months now, and this spring, the trustees engaged the Natural Resource Restoration Group (essentially the LWG) in the debate. The trustees met with the NRRG in late April to discuss a wide range of potential lamprey and sturgeon studies that could help inform both the Portland Harbor RIFS and NRDA. *(One important note here: the list of studies that the trustee group put on the table for discussion included many studies proposed by EI that some members of the trustee group -- including USFWS, ODFW and DEQ -- did not fully support because we didn't think they would produce quality data that would inform either RIFS or NRDA work. With some cajoling from Ron Gouget (NOAA, who is leading the effort to strike a deal between the trustees and NRRG), all trustee members agreed to allow the full suite of studies to be discussed with the NRRG.)*

The April meeting kicked off a series of technical discussions between members of the trustee group and NRRG in an effort to identify lamprey and sturgeon studies that NRRG/LWG would be willing to do as part of RIFS Round 3 sampling. NRRG/LWG has reiterated their willingness to conduct some lamprey and sturgeon studies to support the RIFS and NRDA, and all parties acknowledge that we must reach agreement soon to include any lamprey/sturgeon sampling in the Round 3 data collection effort. *(Another note: ODFW is now playing a more active role in trustee work compared to their involvement in past meetings, and Jennifer and I are coordinating with Rick Kepler and ODFW technical staff to ensure we have a commonly understood "state" position when needed.)*

Early this month, both the NRRG and LWG sent letters to the trustee group stating their willingness to go forward with three of the studies that the trustees proposed: (1) collection of lamprey ammocoetes (juveniles) in the ISA and upstream of the ISA to analyze tissue contaminant concentrations, (2) lamprey ammocoete sensitivity testing to determine how sensitive lamprey are to contaminants compared to other fish species, and (3) collection of pre-breeding sturgeon from the ISA for tissue contaminant analysis. The NRRG and LWG acknowledge that additional studies *may* be needed at some future point (possibly in the Round "3B" sampling effort), but the need for more information can't be determined until data is analyzed from the three studies noted above.

DEQ and ODFW support the NRRG/LWG proposal, but EI and some tribal trustee members would like the NRRG and LWG to agree to do more. Thus, the dialogue is continuing at a technical level, with EI and tribal reps pushing for NRRG/LWG to agree to conduct radio telemetry studies of lamprey and/or sturgeon to better understand how they use the ISA. DEQ and ODFW do not think that radio telemetry studies will give us quality information that we can use in the RIFS and/or NRDA, so we are fine with what the NRRG/LWG has proposed.

Attached are the recent letters from NRRG and LWG, which provide a good summary of the history and status of the lamprey/sturgeon debate.

<< File: 6.2.06.LWG LS Ltr to trustees.pdf >> << File: 6.6.06.NRRG LS Study Ltr.pdf >>

If you have any questions before or after tomorrow's meeting, please let me or Jennifer know. Jennifer -- If I've missed anything here, please feel free to add.

Thanks,
Mikell

Mikell O'Mealy
Portland Harbor Outreach Coordinator
DEQ Northwest Region Office
Phone: 503-229-6590
Email: omealy.mikell@deq.state.or.us